



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/558,437	06/15/2007	Soung Bong Choi	9988.270.00	6131
30827 7590 03/11/2010 MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP 1900 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20006				
EXAMINER STINSON, FRANKIE L				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1792				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/11/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/558,437

Applicant(s)

CHOI ET AL.

Examiner

FRANKIE L. STINSON

Art Unit

1792

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 December 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI/22)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/25/09

1. The indicated allowability of claim 16 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Ellingson et al and Turner et al. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.
2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 13, 14, 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japan'992 (Japan 2-25799290 in view of either Faber et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 2,023,013) or Palotsee (U. S. Pat. No. 2,4374,968) and Kaylan et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 7,318,850).

Re claim 13, Japan'992 is cited disclosing a washer comprising:

a tub (1) for placing items to be washed therein;

a sump (unnumbered) for holding washing water to wash the items in the tub, the sump having a shaft (24, 6), and a screw fastening boss (9) extending downwardly from the bottom surface of the sump, wherein the screw fastening bosses are spaced; and

a motor (23, 6) for generating pumping force to pump the washing water from the sump to the tub, the motor having a screw fastening hole (as at 10) corresponding to the screw fastening boss, thereby the sump and the motor is fixedly secured by the screw fastening boss and the screw fastening hole that differs from the claim only in the recitation of the washer being a dishwasher and the motor having a guide piece and

guide hole. Faber and Palotsee are each cited disclosing that it is old and well known to provide a combination dish and clothes washing machine. It therefore would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, with predictable results, to modify the washer of Japan'992 to include the washing of dishes as taught by either Faber or Palotsee, for the purpose of employing a single machine for dual purposes. It is old and well known to save floor space by employing dual operation in a single machine in a small footprint. All of the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. In regard to the guide hole and guide piece. Kaylan is cited disclosing a guide piece and guide hole for mounting a motor (46, col. 6, lines) as claimed. It therefore would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, with predictable results, to modify the motor of Japan'992, to include a guide piece/hole as taught by Kaylan, with no change in their respective function, for the purpose of securely supporting the motor. It is old and well known to employ guide pieces for the purpose of allowing easy and quick coupling and uncoupling. All of the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Re claim 14, Japan'922 discloses the shaft hole as claimed. Re claim 15, with the guide pieces

being rounded at the end, the same is therefore sloped as claimed. Re claim 17, Japan'992 discloses the seal (13, 38).

4. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the applied prior art as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Ellingson et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 5,118,254), Turner et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 6,877,962) or UK'147 (United Kingdom 1,153,147).

Claim 16 defines over the applied prior art only in the recitation of the plurality of ribs as claimed. Ellingson (unnumbered, see figs. 4, 5), Turner (see fig. 1) and UK'147 (as at 9) are each cited disclosing the radial ribs. It therefore would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, with predictable results, to modify the arrangement of Japan'992 to include the radial ribs as taught by Ellingson, Turner or UK'147 for the purpose of reinforcing the opening. The use of ribs and fins for strengthening/reinforcing purposes is old and well known. All of the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

5. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the applied prior art as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Rasmussen (U. S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0155548), Hasumi (U. S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0084985) or Amrhein et al. (U. S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0090138).

Claim 18 defines over the applied prior art only in the recitation of the motor having a concentrated winding. Rasmussen (see [0009]), Hasumi (see [0053]) and Amrhein (see

[0008]) are each cited disclosing the concentrated winding as claimed. It therefore would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, with predictable results, to modify the motor of Japan'992, to include be as taught by Rasmussen, Hasumi or Amrhein, with no change in their respective function, since it is old and well known to substitute one equally functioning component for another equally functioning component (see MPEP 2144.06 SUBSTITUTING EQUIVALENTS KNOWN FOR THE SAME PURPOSE). All of the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination, (i.e., the combination of known old elements into a single device) would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

6. Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the applied prior art as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of either Kim et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 6,510,716) or Chapin (U. S. Pat. No. 2,656,702).

Claim 19 defines over the applied prior art only in the recitation of the motor being dimensioned as claimed. Kim and Chapin are each cited disclosing the height as claimed. It therefore would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, with predictable results, to modify the motor of Japan'992, to be dimensioned as taught Kim or Chapin, with no change in their respective function, since it is old and well known to substitute one equally functioning component for another equally functioning component (see MPEP 2144.06 SUBSTITUTING EQUIVALENTS KNOWN FOR THE SAME PURPOSE). All of the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one

skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination, (i.e., the combination of known old elements into a single device) would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Re claim 20, Kim discloses the outer rotor.

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Applicant's arguments and/or amendments with respect to the pending claims and/or the rejection thereof have been considered. The arguments and/or amendments with respect to the claims have been effective in defining over previous Office Action, with the current remarks standing moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. In Japan'797, Japan'451, Duncan et al. and Laflame, note the mounting arrangements.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FRANKIE L. STINSON whose telephone number is (571) 272-1308. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 5:30 am to 2:00 pm and some Saturdays from approximately 5:30 am to 11:30 am.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr, can be reached on (571) 272-1700. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/FRANKIE L. STINSON/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792